This Companion Documents has been designed to help you with becoming accredited. Primarily it serves these purposes:

1. Provide insight and information for applicant programs.
2. Explain and describe the types of evidence expected to meet each of the Standards.
3. Ensure clarity for what is provided prior to the site visit as part of the accreditation packet (as compared to what will be viewed during the site visit).

IMPORTANT: the descriptions and evidence provided are NOT prescriptive. The SSH Accreditation Standards are designed to allow simulation programs in any setting apply. It is recognized that there are many ways to achieve outcomes as well. As such, any evidence listed are representative of the types of information that has been acceptable. This companion document should not be considered as a prescriptive list of items all programs must complete, but rather a tool to help each program identify how to best meet each standard.

Should you have any questions about any of the Standards or criterion, or feel that they do not fit your Program for any reason (e.g. cultural), please contact the SSH Accreditation Program at accreditation@ssih.org.

DOCUMENT ELEMENTS:
The standards for each area of Accreditation are broken into different elements:

- Area description (in dark blue)
  - High level description of the overall content in the area of accreditation (Core-ART/S)
- Section header (bold face type with a number in the light blue)
  - The title for the section that groups items together, each area of accreditation has its own number of sections.
- Standard statement (italicized with a lower case letter in the light blue)
  - This is the actual standard that must be met.
- Criterion (items listed in the white areas)
  - These are the items that must be provided to demonstrate meeting the standard.

The column on the right side of the tables is where the examples, clarifications, and descriptive information can be found.

TERMINOLOGY:

**Demonstrate**: this term is consistently used in Standards statements. This means the program must actually show how the standard is met (through the criterion). There are often many ways to demonstrate meeting individual criterion.

**Describe**: this term is used to indicate that a narrative is sufficient as evidence to meet a particular criterion.

**Document**: this term is used to indicate that some form of documentation must be provided as evidence to meet a particular criterion.
### Research Standards and Measurement

Application for Accreditation in Research will be limited to those Programs actively involved in data gathering, analysis, and dissemination of knowledge for advancing the science of simulation.

The 5 Research sections of the Standards are related to: (1) Mission, (2) Research Oversight, (3) Researchers (4) Research Collaboration, and (5) Compliance.

- Programs seeking Accreditation in Research must demonstrate two years of active research in the area of simulation. Activities that demonstrate an active research program include but are not limited to development and implementation of formal research protocols specifically focused on simulation as a technique and as a pedagogy. Simulation can also be used as research tool “test—bed” for evaluation and usability of medical devices, new technology, clinical workflow redesign, facility design etc. This design capability of simulation provides healthcare industry a unique tool to assess and mitigate potential patient harm before clinical implementation, reduce develop cost and improve time to market.

- Submission of research activities are encouraged for peer—reviewed publications that expand the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. MISSION</th>
<th>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. The Simulation Program has an intentional and credible commitment to simulation specific research activities. | - Research should be considered an essential component of the Program’s overall goals.  
- The description of the process:  
  o should be in alignment with Program and institutional goals, and  
  o should describe how research activities are chosen and/or assigned in a way that is consistent with the Program’s goals. |
| i. Document or describe the process that links the research activities to the Program mission and/or vision. | - No information is required to be submitted with the accreditation packet. However, Programs should be prepared to provide documentation for the selected research activities during the site visit.  
- It is important to recognize that while research need not be emphasized as a specific activity in the Program mission and/or vision, the research activities conducted should be within the scope of the Program mission and/or vision. |
| ii. Onsite reviewers will select three (3) research activities to confirm they align with the Program mission and/or vision and the strategic and/or operational plan. | |
| b. The Simulation Program has an established record of organizational and/or financial support for simulation research. | - This criterion is intended to demonstrate the financial commitment made by the Program or organization to ensure a quality program of simulation |
| i. Document or describe the Program’s organizational and/or financial commitment to simulation research. | |
2. **RESEARCH OVERSIGHT**
   
   a. *The Simulation Program has a designated individual responsible for providing administrative oversight of the healthcare simulation research program.*

   i. Provide the CV for individual responsible for oversight of simulation research activities.

   - He biosketch, CV, or resume should demonstrate, as applicable, formal research training, research experience, and research publications in peer-reviewed journals.
   - If the director is new and early in his or her research career (formal training with little publications or research experience), the individual should be under the mentorship of a more seasoned individual. In this case, a biosketch or CV of his/her mentor(s) should be provided and the mentor(s) should be available for interview during onsite review.

   ii. Document or describe the role and responsibilities of the individual responsible for oversight of simulation research activities

   - The person designated for program research oversight need not have an official human resources (HR) or institutional title of the same. However, the role of the individual in overseeing research should be clear to the simulation Program and its affiliated users.
   - This could be demonstrated in a variety of ways including but not limited to:
     - Job description clearly outlining roles and responsibility of the position
     - Designated time allocation to research
     - Letter from supervisor documenting dedicated effort and accountability for the research program

   iii. Demonstrate that the individual responsible for

   - The individual responsible for administering the research program may be in

---

*This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).*

- For the purposes of this standard, the individual(s) responsible for administering the research programs need not be a “core” staff of the simulation Program (e.g., they may be contracted by the simulation Program or have partial effort dedicated to the simulation Program). Nor is the title of “Research Director” required. But the individual should be responsible for research activities.

- The intention here is to highlight the financial commitment to the research program or organization has made to ensure a quality program of simulation research. Examples may include: FTE support for simulation---specific research, investment in statistical support, equipment necessary for simulation research, etc.

  Detailed descriptions of financial commitments are not necessary. Line items or summaries of financial support will suffice.
oversight of simulation research activities has dedicated time (recommend 20% minimum) for oversight of simulation research activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. RESEARCH ACTIVITY</th>
<th>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. The Simulation Program articulates processes by which simulation research activities are evaluated. | • Policies and procedures related to program evaluation such as:  
  - How subjects are protected during research activities  
  - Describe how research activities are evaluated  
  - Frequency (Monthly, quarterly, annually)  
  - Individuals involved in the process  
  - The reviewers will expect to see that the policies and processes show a quality management system approach and that there is continuous improvement.  
  - The focus of this standard is on the outcomes and compliance, and that the Program is able to demonstrate that they are compliant with acceptable research standards. |
| i. Provide a policy and procedure that describes the process utilized for evaluating simulation research activities. This must include how compliance is ensured and how responsible individual(s) are designated. | •  
  - This list should include:  
    - Title of presentation  
    - Name of meeting  
    - Date of meeting  
    - Location of meeting  
    - Presenters  
    - Type of presentation (e.g. poster, podium, etc)  
  - Grouping by research topic may be helpful. The reviewers may use this list to choose presentations to explore, cross-reference, or double-check. |
| b. The Simulation Program has evidence of simulation research activity, including publication and/or presentation of research findings in peer reviewed forums demonstrating a continuum of efforts focused on healthcare simulation. | • The premise for this criterion is that all research activities and knowledge should be intentionally shared and reviewed external to the program. |
| i. Provide a list of presentations involving simulation research within the past 24 months at local, regional, national and/or international meetings or conferences (maximum of 12). |  
  - This list should include:  
    - Title of presentation  
    - Name of meeting  
    - Date of meeting  
    - Location of meeting  
    - Presenters  
    - Type of presentation (e.g. poster, podium, etc)  
  - Grouping by research topic may be helpful. The reviewers may use this list to choose presentations to explore, cross-reference, or double-check. |
ii. Provide a list of peer-reviewed publications involving simulation research within the past 24 months (maximum of 12).

- This list should include:
  - Title of publication (article, or chapter)
  - Journal or Book
  - Authors
  - Date of publication
- Grouping by research topic may be helpful. The reviewers may use this list to choose publications to explore, cross-reference, or double-check.

iii. Provide a list of research activities (current and past) that have not been presented or published in peer-reviewed publications.

- Listed activities should include:
  - Name or title of research project
  - Primary investigator and co-PIs (if applicable)
  - Date, period, or duration of study
  - Status of study (e.g. in progress, finished, etc).
- Grouping by research topic may be helpful. The reviewers may use this list to choose publications to explore, cross-reference, or double-check.
- Current research must be included, even if it is just beginning. The reviewers would like to see all activities, no matter what stage. The Program could even submit a list of proposed activities but should make it clear that these are just proposed.

4. RESEARCHERS
   a. *The Simulation Program has access to qualified simulation researchers.*

   i. Provide accreditation biosketch, and/or CV for the Program’s two most active simulation researchers.

   - There is no specific format for the biosketch but it should highlight research experience
   - Ideally, the two most active researchers should:
     - Be capable of serving as Principle Investigator (PI)
     - Be a senior researcher
     - Be conducting, supervising, and guiding the research activities
     - Have formal research training or equivalent research experience
     - Have extensive research experience
     - Have research publication(s) in peer-reviewed journals

   ii. Submit a brief narrative that describes how the individual(s) involved in simulation research is/are deemed qualified.

   - Discuss why and how the individual(s) are qualified to conduct healthcare simulation research. This can include experience, expertise, training, etc.

   iii. Demonstrate that staff involved in simulation research

   - In the event that educators or other simulation staff are involved in research, it
have appropriate training and/or experience.  

is important that they receive specific research training. This training should be described/document here.

- A list of training opportunities that support development of individual and group expertise in research should be included here.

### iv. Provide a list of periodic (at least quarterly) research engagement activities attended by simulation research staff.

- This could include conferences, round tables, journal clubs or any other similar sorts of activities.

### 5. RESEARCH COLLABORATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. The Simulation Program’s research activities promote collaborative relationships and engagement internal and external to the Program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This standard seeks to ensure the sustainability of a research program through shared knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The premise of this standard is that many research opportunities can be improved through collaboration with others. For example, simulation research staff may not be well-versed in a particular methodology or topic being studied. In this case, research staff are expected to seek out experts and resources from within or outside of their institution. Examples of this type of collaborative and/or cooperative research should be included in the response to this criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Document or describe at least two collaborative and cooperative research relationships within the last 24 months external to the simulation research program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• List may include other collaborating programs, names of individuals, or departments who participated in the research to include the name of the project, dates and role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• While a program must demonstrate two years of collaborative and/or cooperative research, the applicant may provide a list over the past three years if the third year is applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration may be internal to an institution (e.g. other departments) or could be external (e.g. with other simulation programs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. The Simulation Program has evidence of mentoring related to simulation research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Describe how the Program facilitates mentoring relationships and how they function.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide any policy and procedure that outlines the structure of mentoring relationships that may include details such as time commitments of mentor/mentee pairs, oversight responsibilities of mentor, mentee accountability, and/or additional support provided for the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii. Provide a list of mentor/mentee research pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mentors do not need to be employed or have an academic appointment in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(maximum of 10) facilitated by the Simulation Program in the last 24 months. Include a brief description of the associated research for each mentor-mentee relationship.

institute requesting Accreditation, however, the accreditation applicant must demonstrate that the mentor is qualified and has dedicated time to mentor simulation researchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. COMPLIANCE</th>
<th>This is the standard statement. There is no need to provide evidence to meet this particular element (line item).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The Simulation Program is compliant with accepted research standards and/or processes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide policies and procedures related to research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All policies and procedures related to research that have not been included in other Research criteria should be referenced here. These should be detailed enough to demonstrate compliance with all local, regional, country, and national rules and regulations.
- Policies regarding data storage, response to Core criterion 6.ii may be sufficient if all research-related data is maintained by the simulation Program.
- In the event some or all research data is not maintained by the simulation Program, the policies and procedures for data storage at the external individual/location should be included. In this case, a letter from these external individuals/locations should be provided.

| ii. Document or describe compliance with applicable national, regional, and/or institutional research standards. |  |

- The Program should describe a process by which it ensures all research activity is compliant with applicable research standards.
- Onsite, reviewers may ask to see documentation that research activity is compliant with applicable research standards.
- Terminology for compliance activities varies by country, the Program should identify which standard or process is used (e.g. IRB in the U.S.)
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